

**NCES Academic Library Survey
Advisory Committee Meeting
June 2005
Chicago, IL
Agenda**

Meeting One: Thursday, June 23, 2:00-5:30 p.m., Hyatt, Grand Suite 2 A-B

Meeting Two: Friday, June 24, 9:00a.m. -12:30p.m., Hilton, Conference Room 5F

1. Preliminaries
 - a. Introductions (review and update roster)
 - b. Logistics (breaks, other)
 - c. Minutes of Meeting in Boston
 - d. Agenda review

Information Items

2. NCES update
 - a. Status of 2002 data and EDTab (Jeff Williams)

Some enhancements done to tool, allows user to download data into Excel spreadsheet. Must tweak the data. Graphics will be available, bar graphs and pie charts. Working on data beyond the 2002 tool, has a draft of the data documentation. Six weeks until data set on web. 2000 will come but there was a priority of having the 2002 data available. The target date for release of the 2004 data is spring of 2006.

3. Other surveys and projects that do or could have an impact on IPEDS and ALS
 - a. ACRL (Hugh Thompson)

Have completed 04 data collection, schedule is slightly behind. Will be publishing in mid-July. Encountered some push back. Trends section larger than normal. Plan to do a quick survey again to find what changes are needed, do you care, do you use this, a survey on feedback. Database size is about 3000. Participation is down to 42%. Need to find out if there is a legitimate need.

- b. ARL (Martha Kyrillidou)

Has completed the annual data collection, supplemental data coming soon. Data under review currently. Next year there will be clarification regarding the Code of Practice. There will be a draft white paper making a case for more standardization. Web-metrics, Project COUNTER is a part of this. Development of a resource called Utopia, well-identified user base and commitment, data bank of 180 questions, users only get 5 questions.

Brinley Franklin – Will continue the traditional counts of print volume. Taskforce contains three groups from ARL. Want to reflect what they actually offer, instead of who owns what, in the case of usage through a consortia. Shared repository of collections. Longitudinal data is not as good as in the past, because of overlapping of volumes (paper and electronic).

Jeff Williams – OMB clearance packages. A response rate of about 88% is necessary on a survey of about 4000 eligible participants.

d. Oberlin Group (Victoria Hanawalt)

Change of representation and relocation of survey. Collect data in fall, due in October. Meet in September. Origin of data is used solely for the Groups use. Not an assessment tool. The statistics aren't shared. Acquisition's survey, what they spend and weeding, withdrawals, etc.

e. NCLIS (Trudi Hahn)

Budget situation is flat lined. Renewed NCES this year. Initiative comes from a commissioner, José Aponte, metrics to grow performance indicators. Benchmarking, balanced scorecard and drilling it down to public libraries. ROI.

f. NISO Z39.7 (Denise Davis)

Advisory Group and Technical Group (electronic metrics) to review the vendors to provide. Maintenance for 5 years with interim review of the ballot.

g. Salary Survey – Web-based instrument.

Issues with response rate and data quality. September publishing. Salary survey for support staff. Electronic tool to do comparisons and search by data type. Would not be specific. Will put out a comparison database, this is an issue for this year.

Action Items

4. 2004 Survey

a. Review questions and definitions (Denise Davis)

i. Problems of 2004 respondents (see attached table)

Six questions that were about expenditures and count. A high level of confusion regarding the questions.

Question 10 – Library Expenditures

Do we need to describe what a serial backfile is? A periodical backfile. What portion of the question is not understood? Mention JSTOR as an example of a backfile. Is this a one-time charge or an ongoing cost. Could possibly give examples of what goes where, purchasing issues. Add one-time initial fee for JSTOR to alleviate confusion. Subset of question is including sales tax.

Not current subscriptions.

Question 11 – Use broadest term, 11 is the gross figure. Improve this explanation.

Question 13 – Needs clarification

Question 14 – JSTOR subscriptions to serials, ongoing costs. Strike membership and adding subscriptions.

Question 18, 19, 20 – Operating budget, capital expenditures, put this in report operating.

Explanations of capital and operating expenditures. Question 19 what is a network? Is it about the organization. What amount of budget goes to consortia, networks, etc? Enumerate what you are actually looking for, exclude purchase of equipment, software.

Question 25, 26 and 27 – Special collection materials (Digital Collections included) – the issue a/v and slides, digital image collections. How do people report this type of collection? Is there any national significant to reporting titles or pieces. There is an issue of ownership of digital

collections. Who actually owns the collection, sort of like databases. Susan - If there is a bib record it should get counted, used the analogy of microfiche. Must be careful in how this is done. Brinley used ArtStore as an example of one item. Where do you draw the line? Short section on digital libraries. Maybe 2 or 3 questions on digitization. How do they count? Ask those that responded yes, in a short questionnaire about digitization. Kaleen to check on the total that responded yes to question 40 – digitization. Artifacts, how to count? Clarification needed.

Question 22 – Not catalogued cannot count the collection, if catalogued count them.

Question 23 – E-books – if it's in your catalogue count, whether it belongs to a consortia or not. Should read catalogued and not purchased.

Question 26 and 27 – Confusion how to respond. What can be done to those questions to clarify. Examples of what to include and what not to include. Clarification

Take JSTOR out of the examples. People will count JSTOR even though it is not supposed to be included. JSTOR should be with Question 27. The products are morphing into other areas.

Question 26 – Cover to cover access, maybe. Or elaborate further on question 27.

Brinley volunteered Martha and Leslie volunteered to help rephrase questions 26 and 27.

Question 33 – ILL – Documents delivered from commercial services, being added as ILL. Are commercial document delivery still relevant and need to be added as an ILL. Does it need to be broken out? Consensus is that it can be added into #28B and #31, listed as non-returnables. Interlibrary loans and document delivery provided between libraries – Section Title.

Cannot change definitions of circulation.

ii. Status of 2004 survey data analysis (Patty O'Shea, Kaleen Vaden)
4,124 in universe, 3431 eligible, 70 parents reported for 193 children. 628 non-respondents, 13 refusals, no really a refusal but just non-respondents that notified they were unable to complete the survey. One Christian school that refused, find out who this is and be sure they aren't surveyed in the future (refuseniks). 140 were out of scope and 9 schools closed.

Part H only 101 did not respond to this question. Confusion over lines 26 and 27. Denise sent these questions for subject matter explanations. There was also confusion over what to include in Part C – Expenditures.

Part E broken out into two sections for clarity.

Part F – Gate count - issues with separating out patronage when the library is public and academic

Number 5 on the update – there were only 3 schools that were totally electronic. Clarification would be needed. No print collection could be used to clarify.

Need to include a question about electronic services. Access to hits on electronic service usage or whether in-house or remote usage via home computer. What was the reasoning behind not including this question? Why not included in 2004 survey? Is electronic usage only restricted to

students and faculty, or is it accessible by the general public? Most libraries are giving unrestricted access to the collection via computer.

For 2006 can there be two questions, one to measure in-house usage and another to address remote usage. Questions about electronic usage are problematic, would need to clarify what questions to add and how they would be worded. Use session, searches, full-text downloads – these are standardized terminology. One problem with measuring this do we want to know about all use, distance use? What do we want to measure? Do you care about the use of the catalog, who accessed it? How would in-house usage be measured? Can it be measured? Electronic usage can be differentiated from in-house and external use – based on IP address. Keeping it simple would make it more accurate and useful. What will we get from asking these questions? Will pursue adding 3 or 4 questions. Web does not match print instructions for Question 34. One will need to be corrected to reflect the correct wording and terminology. Discuss including the usage of electronic searches, NISO has terms, for searches, etc.

Would there be a problem with adding a new section?

5. 2006 Survey

- a. Form and definitions: what edits/changes make sense for 2006 based on:
 - i. Information Literacy questions

There was a favorable response for 2004 survey questions. NCES would like to keep these questions on the survey. What would be the value of repeating these questions on the 2006 survey? Is it enough to just look at the numbers already provided? Do we need to have questions that elaborate more on the type of information literacy programs? What type of sessions do you teach? Credit, non-credit? Has your college or university formally recognized information literacy? **Do we want to change the way we ask questions 35 and 36? Kaleen will break down numbers by sections.** Does your institution officially recognize information literacy? Do we now need to ask more detailed questions? Do we drill down further? By 2008 link information literacy to university support, possibly? Jeff will take back the concerns of the group about the information literacy questions. Where is the link to the library? What motivates the respondents to answer is the information that would help the library understand where it stands.

- b. Help desk suggestions

No specific issues from the helpdesk. There were 40 libraries that were out of scope and they were able to get new addresses. Collected alternate addresses that could be used for mailings.

- c. New developments (e.g. Consortia purchasing, shared storage facilities, electronic collections, multi-type libraries (academic/public))

Only 6 answered the supplemental questions about shared storage facilities. Will stay on 2005 ARL survey. Multi-type issues – how do you report collections? Do you want to make designations to the types of multi-type libraries? Think of some type of question that designates whether they are shared? Denise will send out public school definition on multi-type institutions. Do we want to make it more explicit? What do we want to really know, how to report circulation or is it about expenditures?

- d. Criteria for eligibility: do they need updating?

Eligibility questions are okay.

- e. Mailing procedures: something went wrong again this year, (initial mailing, manual, director's letter, keyholder info, etc.). How can we do better?

- 6. Timeliness of data.

Next week Census will run diagnostics, Ed-Tab shells are being worked on should be finished in the next week or so. Peer tool available by June 2006. Data set drives the peer tool.

Dinner: Thursday, 5:45pm at 200 North Columbus Drive (Aria), 312.444.9494